

**MINUTES OF  
THE EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING  
10:00 A.M., FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2023  
VIA ZOOM  
COCHISE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CONFERENCE ROOM  
1415 WEST MELODY LANE, BUILDING G, BISBEE, AZ 85603**

OFFICERS PRESENT: Gomez, David – Greenlee County (1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Chair) **(In-Person)**  
Ortega, Richard – City of Safford (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice-Chair) **(In-Person)**  
Budge, Ken – City of Bisbee (Treasurer) **(In-Person)**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ahmann, Steve – Greenlee County Private Sector Representative **(Zoom)**  
Barlow, Bill – City of Tombstone **(In-Person)**  
Blake, Titus – Town of Duncan **(Zoom)**  
Boyle, Patrick – City of Benson **(Zoom)**  
Budd, David – Santa Cruz County Private Sector Representative **(Zoom)**  
David, Paul – Greenlee County **(Zoom)**  
English, Ann – Cochise County **(In-Person)**  
Floyd, Heather – Cochise County Private Sector Representative **(In-Person)**  
Lopez, Ed – Graham County Private Sector Representative **(Zoom)**  
Maldonado, Jorge – City of Nogales **(Zoom)**  
Montoya, Luis – Town of Clifton **(Zoom)**  
Umphrey, Carolyn – City of Sierra Vista **(In-Person)**  
Valle, Daniel – Cochise County Private Sector Representative **(In-Person)**

STAFF PRESENT: Curtiss, Dina – Accounting Manager **(In-Person)**  
Dennis, Keith – Community Development Program Manager **(In-Person)**  
Heiss, Randy – Executive Director **(In-Person)**  
Merideth, John – GIS Analyst **(Zoom)**  
Peterson, Stephen – Economic Development Program Manager **(Zoom)**  
Vertrees, Chris – Transportation Program Administrator **(In-Person)**  
Villa, Laura – Area Agency on Aging Program Director **(Zoom)**

GUESTS: Adam, Kevin – RTAC **(Zoom)**

**I. CALL TO ORDER/ESTABLISH QUORUM**

**1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Chair Gomez** called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. **Supervisor Ann English, Cochise County**, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Randy Heiss called the names of those present at the meeting – a quorum was established. Randy Heiss welcomed Benson **Vice-Mayor Patrick Boyle** to his first meeting of the Executive Board.

**II. MEMBER ENTITIES' DISCUSSION**

**Supervisor Ann English** stated she always likes to take the opportunity to thank SEAGO for its support for the Douglas Two-Port solution. She reported that the port construction has been funded and the County and Douglas are working on funding for the infrastructure. She also stated housing will be needed for the workforce and she hopes the private sector will step up to provide it. She again thanked SEAGO for being the first to recognize that when southeastern Arizona thrives, we all thrive. **Private Sector Representative Daniel Valle** stated he had been contacted American Immigration Business Coalition, a non-partisan organization seeking to further immigration by bringing skilled labor in to meet the needs of businesses across the country. They are working on a bi-partisan immigration proposal to Congress to address the shortages of workers and wants to visit southeastern Arizona to understand what the needs are here. **Councilman Bill Barlow, Tombstone**, thanked Supervisor Ann English for all of her service and the work she does for Cochise County. He also mentioned that like many other communities in the region,

Tombstone has a tremendous shortage of affordable housing that needed to be addressed. **Private Sector Representative Heather Floyd** announced that after a five-month delay, the U.S. Treasury had finally released \$99.4 million to Arizona Commerce Authority for broadband expansion projects in Arizona – several of them in the SEAGO region.

### III. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

No one from the public was present.

### IV. ACTION ITEMS

1. Consent Agenda
  - a. Approval of the November 18, 2022, minutes
  - b. Nomination(s) to the Advisory Council on Aging

**1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Chair Gomez** called for a motion to approve the consent agenda. **Supervisor Ann English** made the motion; Second by **Councilmember Bill Barlow**.

**MOTION:** Ann English  
**SECOND:** Bill Barlow  
**ACTION:** Unanimous

*Note: At the request of Chris Montague-Breakwell of ADEQ agenda item #5 was moved up on the agenda. The discussion and consideration of item #5 occurred directly after item 1 for approval of the Consent Agenda but appears in these minutes in the order listed on the agenda.*

#### 2. Election of Officers for Calendar Year 2023

Randy Heiss referred to his memo on Page 9 of the packet outlining the Bylaws procedure for the annual election and rotation of officers. He explained that in calendar year 2023, the Greenlee County Executive Board officer will be elevated to the Chair position; the Graham County officer to First Vice-Chair; the Cochise County officer to Second Vice-Chair; and the Santa Cruz County officer will drop to the bottom of the rotation. Randy also reported that Supervisor Gomez remains willing to continue as the Greenlee County officer, Vice-Mayor Ortega remains willing to continue serving as the Graham County officer, Mayor Budge is willing to continue serving as the Cochise County officer on the Executive Board for one more year, and Mayor Jorge Maldonado has indicated that he would be interested in representing Santa Cruz County on the Executive Board if so nominated. He then reminded the Board that nothing in the Bylaws prevents the Executive Board from nominating and electing an entirely new slate of officers or a combination of existing and new officers, providing the individuals nominated meet the requirements of office at the time of election. Randy then offered to answer any questions.

**Supervisor Ann English** stated her belief that there is significant value in retaining the slate of officers who have been serving on the Executive Board if they have been showing a commitment to their duties and they remain interested in serving. She also stated that if there are others interested in serving, they need to make their desire known so they can be considered.

**Supervisor Ann English** made a motion to elect the following slate of officers for calendar year 2023; second by **Representative Daniel Valle**:

Chair: Supervisor David Gomez, Greenlee County  
First Vice-Chair: Vice-Mayor Richard Ortega, Graham County  
Second Vice-Chair: Mayor Ken Budge, Cochise County  
Treasurer: Mayor Jorge Maldonado, Santa Cruz County Officer

**MOTION:** Ann English  
**SECOND:** Daniel Valle  
**ACTION:** Unanimous

3. Discussion and possible action to appoint a Recruitment Committee for the selection of the next SEAGO Executive Director

Randy Heiss reminded the Board that they had voted to form a Recruitment Committee consisting of the Executive Committee (the officers of the Executive Board) and three at-large members of the Executive Board who wish to have a voice in creating a list of interview questions, reviewing resumes and screening any internal or external candidates, and recommending those qualified for interviews to the Executive Board. With the Executive Committee for calendar year 2023 having been established, three at-large members of the Executive Board need to be appointed to complete the composition of the Recruitment Committee. He stated he had invited individuals from the Executive Board to serve on the Recruitment Committee and the following individuals expressed an interest:

Graham County Supervisor Paul David  
Santa Cruz County Private Sector Representative David Budd  
Cochise County Private Sector Representative Daniel Valle

Randy then offered to answer any questions. **Councilman Luis Montoya** stated that he recalled seeing invitations to serve on the Recruitment Committee from Randy on numerous occasions and appreciates the fact that several have come forward willing to serve. **Representative Heather Floyd** commented that the addition of the at large members reflects the mixed representation of public and private interests on the Executive Board and felt it was a great body to move forward with. **Mayor Pro-Tem Carolyn Umphrey** asked for clarification of the duties of the Recruitment Committee. Randy responded that the Committee would be responsible for creating a list of interview questions, reviewing the resumes of candidates, and recommending those whom they deem qualified for an interview with the full Executive Board.

**Councilman Luis Montoya** made a motion to appoint the Executive Committee and the three at-large members of the Executive Board (as listed above) who had expressed an interest to serve as the Recruitment Committee for the next SEAGO Executive Director; Second by **Councilman Bill Barlow**.

**MOTION:** Luis Montoya  
**SECOND:** Bill Barlow  
**ACTION:** Unanimous

4. Discussion and possible action to authorize staff to publish a Request for Proposals for a Compensation Study

Randy Heiss explained that SEAGO's Compensation Plan has not been updated since it was adopted in 2005 and the salary grade and range structure has become increasingly uncompetitive when compared to other COGs, MPOs, and many of our member entities. As a result, we continue to lose employees and experience considerable difficulty recruiting qualified professionals to replace those who have left the organization. In an effort to increase SEAGO's wage competitiveness, he requested authorization to issue a solicitation for proposals to identify a qualified consultant to perform a compensation study for the organization. He stated he anticipate the cost of such a study could exceed \$20,000 and according to SEAGO's procurement policy, purchases valued above this level must have prior Executive Board approval to go to bid.

He further explained that he had explored cooperative purchasing opportunities, but thus far, had not identified any. He also explained that he intends to explore the possibility for assistance from member entities that may have the capacity to assist SEAGO with such a study. The Board's authorization would allow him to move forward in the event these opportunities do not exist. He stated that if he moves forward with the procurement authorization, based on a stipulation added by the Administrative Council, he would

bring the consulting contract back to the Administrative Council and Executive Board at a future meeting for approval. Randy then offered to answer any questions.

**Councilman Bill Barlow** made a motion to authorize the Executive Director to publish a request for proposals for a compensation study, evaluate proposals received, prepare a contract with a qualified consultant for approval of the Executive Board as recommended by the Administrative Council; Second by **Mayor Ken Budge**.

**Councilman Luis Montoya** asked how many employees SEAGO currently has. Randy responded that the number is between 20 and 25 employees. Mr. Montoya then asked what the consulting firm would be doing, and if this study could be done in house by someone at SEAGO. Randy responded that he would not be the best person to do such a study as he wouldn't be considered an objective party. **Representative Daniel Valle** stated that he has worked in HR for more than 13 years and a study such as this needs to be done by classification experts who survey like organizations with similar positions and develop recommendations based on those responses. **Supervisor Ann English** stated that City and County HR staff rely heavily on the salary and benefit surveys performed by NACO and the League of Cities, but SEAGO is a different type of organization with positions that are not typically found within the structures of counties or cities. **Representative David Budd** stated that he was skeptical that consultants would do little more than relieve SEAGO of the funding to perform the study so he did not support this request. **Mayor Ken Budge** stated that he serves on the League of Cities and Towns Executive Committee and that Bisbee draws from the League's annual study and makes adjustments based on local market conditions. Randy thanked the Board for their comments and reminded Mr. Montoya that if they did not like the proposals received from prospective consultants to perform the study, the Board would have an opportunity to reject the proposals when they are brought back to the Board for approval in May.

**MOTION:** Bill Barlow  
**SECOND:** Ken Budge  
**ACTION:** 14 Ayes and 2 Nays (Luis Montoya and David Budd)

5. Discussion and consideration of Resolution No. 2023-01 serving notice of SEAGO's intention to de-designate as a planning agency under Section 208 of the Clean Water Act

*Note: This agenda item was taken out of the order posted on the agenda. The discussion and consideration of this item occurred immediately after agenda item 1 above for approval of the Consent Agenda.*

Randy Heiss referred the Board to his memorandum on Page 13 outlining the history of SEAGO's designation as a planning agency under Section 208 of the Clean Water Act (CWA), some of the Water Quality Management (WQM) Program responsibilities SEAGO has been expected to perform, the lack of adequate funding provided to Designated Planning Agencies (DPAs), and the deteriorating partnership between ADEQ and the State's DPAs.

Randy reported that the Administrative Council had held a lengthy discussion on the matter at their meeting on February 9<sup>th</sup> wherein several Administrative Council members expressed concerns with the uncertainty around how changes to their wastewater treatment plans could potentially be impacted by ADEQ administering the program in the SEAGO region or other disadvantages that may not be evident at this time. After considerable discussion, the Administrative Council unanimously recommended that the Executive Board table approval of the proposed Resolution until ADEQ can make clear: 1) which WQMP ADEQ will operate under (State plan versus SEAGO's WQMP); 2) whether or not de-designation will impact SEAGO member entities' ability to access EPA funding; and 3) the Department can provide assurances that they have the capacity to process their updates to wastewater master plans, expansions of their service area boundaries, consistency reviews, or if applicable, plan amendments, in an expeditious, timely, and streamlined manner - if and when SEAGO de-designates.

Randy stated that the Administrative Council was invited to attend a meeting of the Statewide Water Quality Management Working Group (WQMWG) on February 15, 2023 where SEAGO and members of the Administrative Council posed questions to ADEQ staff relating to the impact of SEAGO's de-designation. Randy provided a list of SEAGO's questions and the responses of ADEQ at that meeting for the Board's

information but explained that the person from ADEQ attending that meeting lacked the information and authority to adequately respond to the questions asked. As a result, Chris Montague-Breakwell, Environmental Program Manager with ADEQ joined the meeting via Zoom to answer these questions. In opening, Mr. Montague-Breakwell (CM-B) stated that local planning is important and essential to water quality in Arizona whether it be through the 208 Program or other locally initiated efforts.

Before beginning the questions, Randy stated that ADEQ's WQM Plan was written in 1979 and appeared to be a roadmap to how the State would implement the 1977 amendments to the CWA. He stated that it was written before ADEQ existed, relied heavily on multiple State agencies in existence at the time and the DPAs for implementation, gives significant deference to the regional WQMPs developed and adopted by the DPAs, and to the best of his knowledge, has not been updated since. He then proceeded to ask these questions:

**Question 1:** When SEAGO de-designates as an areawide planning agency, it's clear under 40 CFR Part 130.5(a) that the State agency (ADEQ) will be required "to assume direct responsibility for continued water quality planning and oversight of implementation within the area." Given the age of the State's WQMP and the fact that it relies so heavily on the areawide plans of the DPAs, it's hard to imagine how ADEQ could use that document alone to process consistency reviews for our member entities. SEAGO's plan was certified by the Governor and EPA in 2012 so it clearly complies with the CWA. It was modeled after the Yuma WQMP and minimizes the processes to where there should almost never be a need for a community to process a plan amendment. It's lean, streamlined, and focused on complying with the CWA while giving our communities maximum flexibility. So with that in mind, what happens to SEAGO's WQMP post-de-designation? Would ADEQ adopt SEAGO's WQMP in assuming planning responsibilities as required under 40 CFR Part 130?

*CM-B: "It's not entirely clear because we don't have precedent for part of a 208 Program in the State unwinding. Certainly there are many states that simply no longer do 208 whatsoever. So how we would proceed is we would revert back to that, admittedly quite old WQM Plan for ensuring 208 requirements are met. And note that EPA considers that old 1970s era planning document, sort of a one-time submission and they now use other tools, memorandums of agreement on particular water quality components of the Clean Water Act, to ensure that the state is meeting those requirements. Those are updated frequently and then we have performance partnership agreements with EPA that are updated every two years so they set certain expectations for us. But note that we would not step into the designated planning agency's shoes and start writing plans approving local wastewater treatment expansions or connections. That, we feel, is ultimately a local decision. And whether or not you want to continue as a DPA and continue that as a planning process or do it outside of that planning process, that's something that is, I think, best left done at the city and county level. So ADEQ isn't going to step in and provide the level of sort of oversight or integration that a DPA typically would. ADEQ would continue doing the water quality assessments that we are currently doing statewide; we would write permits, both for discharging to groundwater - that's our Aquifer Protection Program permits - and those include some kind of level of engineering review. When there's a new facility, or when there's a significant change to an existing facility, where there's a discharge to a protected surface water, issue an AZPDES permit, but that wouldn't change from how we've historically been doing things. So that wouldn't be new or a surprise to anyone here about how we did that."*

**Question 2:** When SEAGO de-designates as an areawide planning agency, what impact would it have to our communities seeking EPA funding for infrastructure project planning, development and implementation? Randy stated that question was answered by Julia at the WQMWG meeting where she said she didn't believe there was going to be impact and asked CM-B if he had an update on that.

*CM-B: "That's correct. There wouldn't be an impact. I would add that there are some EPA grants where scoring is higher, and you're more likely to get awarded if you have some kind of plan already in place. But whether or not that's a 208 Plan or a local treatment plan drawn up outside of any 208 process, I don't think EPA would discriminate in that case."*

**Question 3:** When SEAGO de-designates as an areawide planning agency, what assurances can the Department provide our member entities in terms of a seamless transition – i.e. that ADEQ has the capacity to process their updates to wastewater master plans, expansions of their service area boundaries, consistency reviews, or if applicable, plan amendments, in an expeditious, timely, and streamlined manner?

Randy added that he believed the answer to the first question answered this question as well in terms of how ADEQ would ensure a seamless transition, that you have the capacity to process consistency reviews, or if applicable, plan amendments and I'm hearing it was that you would, leave that to the locals. Whatever they're doing would be handled in the permit process, and therefore water quality is protected.

*CM-B: That's correct. ADEQ really wants to focus on the state level water quality protections and issues of where and how to build these wastewater treatment plants. You know, who's served by its collection, system upgrade or expansion - that's something that's best addressed by the locals, and we're certainly not going to jump in and interfere with that. We're sticking purely to protecting the statewide water quality standards when the facility is operational, but not the, why is the facility built? Where is it built? When is it built? Who does it serve? That's all a local decision.*

**Question 4:** Would ADEQ be able to join the Executive Board meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> to provide answers to these questions if provided a link to the Zoom meeting?

*Answered by ADEQ's presence at the meeting.*

**Question 5:** On February 15<sup>th</sup>, Matt McLachlan (Sierra Vista) had asked "What's the prospect of ADEQ increasing funding to DPAs at a level sufficient to cover SEAGO's administrative costs?" Randy stated he believed the answer to this question would be "almost zero". He doesn't believe there's enough money to cover DPAs' costs. And certainly the intention isn't there as this is the third time that we've heard that ADEQ doesn't intend to fund the 208 Program beyond the end of fiscal year 2024. Randy asked if ADEQ had a different view on this question.

*CM-B: I don't. At current funding levels we're getting from the feds, the DPAs get 1000s to run the 208 Programs and that is far, far short of the work that you put into it.*

Randy stated that funding is not the primary reason why he is interested in de-designating; it feels like DPAs are being distanced. He stated that he had heard more today from ADEQ about potentially what would be considered the Department's vision for the 208 Program, and with your answers to our questions - that you're just kind of unwinding the program - or that it's the intent of the Department to let it unwind itself.

*CM-B: The content of DPA-written 208 Plans across the state nowadays largely read more like zoning documents rather than what I would consider water quality considerations. And you do actually have to consider where and how when you're siting wastewater facilities - that is an important part of protecting water quality, but that's one that's ultimately best left with the local authorities. And then at the state level, if you build a facility, then you have to meet these standards when you discharge. But that would be the extent of our involvement. You know, cities and counties are free to continue planning and writing and implementing plans that read very much alike or even identical to existing 208 Plans outside of the 208 planning process, and you don't need the state's authority to do so. The 208 planning process used to have a much bigger role when there was so called wastewater treatment grant funding attached to it in the late 1970s and 80s. Back when there was a big lift, to meet these new Clean Water Act requirements, and so you had to have a plan in place in order to get that grant funding - the 10s or hundreds of millions of funding that used to be attached to that. Those funds are all gone, and with it, a lot of the urgency for creation of those plans. So, you know, I think there's sort of an open question about whether or not it's lived its useful life. Many states do not run a 208 Program any longer, or those that do, it serves a different sort of planning purpose.*

Randy then went on to explain that he values the recommendations of the Administrative Council and encouraged the Executive Board to always give strong consideration to those recommendations in reaching their decisions. However, Randy reminded the Board that SEAGO had spent the afternoon of February 9<sup>th</sup> and the morning of February 10<sup>th</sup> in a Strategic Planning Retreat with our member entities to identify their priorities and the organization's priorities that SEAGO should focus on over the next two years. The retreat participants identified many priorities that could bring value to their communities and build the capacity of SEAGO to better serve them, but the 208 WQM Program was not mentioned among them. Randy explained the dichotomy that this creates – does SEAGO now prioritize implementing fees and/or assessments for a program that has long been regarded as an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy by our member entities over the priorities identified by those participating in the retreat?

He stated that if SEAGO is expected to continue administering the 208 WQM Program, it would be necessary to identify funding to do so. The lack of State and Federal funding to administer the program means local funding must be raised through fees to cover the costs of consistency reviews, public participation, and plan amendments. In addition, local funding must be raised through an assessment to cities and towns to build and maintain capacity to operate the 208 WQM Program when he retires.

Randy stated that as he sees it, the Board can choose from three options in considering potential action on this matter: 1) Do nothing and fund the 208 WQM Program from SEAGO's fund balance; 2) Table the item and direct SEAGO to develop fees and/or assessments for consideration at a future meeting; or 3) approve Resolution No. 2023-01 indicating SEAGO's intention to de-designate as an areawide planning agency under Section 208 of the CWA. Randy offered to do his best to answer questions.

**Councilman Luis Montoya** stated he understands the funding SEAGO receives to operate the program to be less than \$6,000 per year. Randy confirmed the amount to be about \$5,500 last fiscal year. Mr. Montoya then asked how SEAGO expends those funds. Randy responded that he responds to phone calls from engineering firms working on permits for member entity wastewater operations. He also processes consistency reviews as needed – some of which trigger a public review process which require additional activities. He also participates in the WQMWG meetings. But often he finds himself only doing what's necessary to preserve funding in the event of a consistency review so that State funding is available when needed and it does not become necessary to use SEAGO funds to operate the program. Councilman Montoya stated that he greatly respects the questions, concerns and recommendations of the Administrative Council, but based on the information presented by ADEQ, he was of the opinion that the Board should accept the Resolution. **Councilman Luis Montoya** made a motion to approve Resolution 2023-01 providing notice to the Governor of SEAGO's intention to de-designate as a planning agency under Section 208 of the CWA; Second by **Vice-Mayor Richard Ortega**.

**Supervisor Paul David** asked several questions. First, what would be the amount of an assessment to build and maintain capacity for the 208 Program if SEAGO were to de-designate. Randy responded that assuming a ¼ time position at \$45,000 per year it would require roughly \$11,000 in salary, plus EREs at between 30 – 40% of salary, the total cost would be something less than \$20,000 annually spread between the fourteen cities and towns in the region. Secondly, Mr. David asked who would operate the program after Randy retires, and if someone would need to be hired to take on the program. Randy responded that he did have someone in-house that could take the program on, but that person was hired to help with the CDBG Program and is just coming up to speed. Then, there is always a chance that person could move on, which would create a need to train someone else – thus the need for an assessment to maintain capacity for the program. The third question is what the other COGs (or DPAs) are doing with the program. Is SEAGO the only one considering de-designation and are we going to be the first domino to fall? Randy responded that the first domino fell back in 1997 when WACOG de-designated. At that time, ADEQ convinced Mojave, La Paz, and Yuma counties to take on the 208 Planning requirements, but it seems the philosophy at ADEQ has changed since that time. He further mentioned that Mojave County had asked him for a copy of SEAGO's resolution. Mr. David's final question and comment was a concern for water and wastewater use and reutilization. He stated he was reluctant for SEAGO to relinquish a leadership role in wastewater planning that might respond to wastewater reuse. Randy stated that wastewater treated to effluent quality that can be discharged to a water body or reused in a city park is something that is handled through permits issued by ADEQ so SEAGO's de-designation would have no impact on communities wishing to do that. It's really a question of whether or not a community has the funds and commitment to go through the engineering and permitting process and build the facility improvements to meet permit requirements.

**Supervisor Ann English** expressed her opinion that the 208 Program was another layer of process in the way of communities wishing to ensure their wastewater treatment needs are met and counties don't have a stake in the issue. **Councilman Bill Barlow** stated that he had heard enough that he was ready to call for the question. **Mayor Ken Budge** spoke of the City of Bisbee's intentions to discharge to the San Pedro River. They had been working on the permitting for several years to do so and SEAGO's name had never come up in the discussion. **Mayor Pro-Tem Carolyn Umphrey** asked when SEAGO had last been asked to review a member agency's wastewater plan. Randy stated that this is likely the unwinding of the program that has been spoken of earlier. SEAGO should have seen a 208 Consistency Review form for the Bisbee

permit modification but had not seen such a form from any entity in the region for 1 ½ - 2 years. **1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Chair Gomez** called for the question.

**MOTION:** Luis Montoya  
**SECOND:** Richard Ortega  
**ACTION:** Unanimous

6. Discussion and possible action to approve SEAGO 2023 - 2027 TIP Amendment #4

Chris Vertrees reported that the Transportation Advisory Committee had approved the 2023 – 2027 TIP Amendment #4 at their regular meeting on January 19th. The TIP Amendment involves an HSIP project for Santa Cruz County that is programmed for construction in FY2023 for \$424,350 in Federal funds. The bids for the project greatly exceeded the amount programmed. The shortfall for Santa Cruz County is \$348,903. SEAGO has \$125,000 in unused FY23 STBG that can be used to offset Santa Cruz County's costs. If approved, an additional \$125,000 in Federal funding combined with \$7,556 local funding would be added to the TIP with Santa Cruz County responsible for the remaining balance of \$223,903 to complete the project. Chris stated that the Administrative Council had unanimously recommended approval of the SEAGO 2023 - 2027 TIP Amendment #4 at their February 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Mayor Jorge Maldonado** asked if Santa Cruz County was aware of the commitment to provide additional local funding for the project. Chris responded that they were involved in the decision to amend the TIP and he has been in discussions with the Santa Cruz County Public Works Department.

**Supervisor Ann English** made a motion to approve SEAGO 2023 - 2027 TIP Amendment #4; Second by **Vice Mayor Richard Ortega**.

**MOTION:** Ann English  
**SECOND:** Richard Ortega  
**ACTION:** Unanimous

## V. INFORMATION ITEMS

### A. Future Meeting Dates

Randy Heiss mentioned that the next meeting of the Executive Board will be held May 19, 2023 somewhere in Graham County. He also mentioned that there would be a need for the Administrative – Executive Committees to meet telephonically on March 30th to conduct program related, time sensitive business between regular meetings of the Administrative Council and Executive Board. The business would involve approval of the 2024 – 2028 Draft TIP for public comment and the approval of the FY 2024 - 2025 Work Program with ADOT. He asked the officers to please mark their calendars.

### B. Quarterly Finance Report

Dina Curtiss provided an update on SEAGO finances and responded to questions.

### C. Community Development Report

Keith Dennis provided an update on Community Development Programs and responded to questions.

### D. SEAGO Economic Development District Report

Stephen Peterson provided an update on Economic Development and responded to questions.

### E. AAA Updates

Laura Villa provided an update on AAA programs and responded to questions.

### F. Transportation Program Updates

Chris Vertrees provided an update on Transportation Programs and responded to questions.



## **VI. RTAC REPORT**

Kevin Adam provided an update and responded to questions.

## **VII. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS / CURRENT EVENTS**

Randy Heiss announced that he had had a lengthy discussion with Maggie Farry, Intergovernmental Affairs Director for Governor Hobbs. He reported the items of mutual interest that were discussed and possible areas of collaboration between SEAGO and the Governor's Office. He also reported that SEAGO had been working with Arizona Government Training Services to organize a Supervisor's Academy in southeastern Arizona and had found significant interest in SEAGO member entities sending staff to this excellent supervisory and leadership training opportunity. He also stated that SEAGO partnered with the Arizona Eastern Railroad to be the applicant for a Federal Railroad Administration grant to help finance improvements to their rail infrastructure to make it more resistant to climate change. Randy stated that SEAGO would be compensated for administration of the grant if awarded and indemnified from having to contribute matching funds or bear the expense of any cost overruns on the project. He also mentioned that SEAGO would be assisting Willcox Theater and Arts with the administration of their EDA grant. SEAGO's involvement would be limited to compliance in the procurement of the construction contractor, monitoring the contractor's compliance with the Davis-Bacon wage rates, and general technical assistance.

## **VIII. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Randy Heiss reminded the Board that the next meeting will include the presentation of the FY 2023 audit; approval of FY 2024 budget items; possible approval of a consulting contract to update SEAGO's compensation plan; approval of the Area Plan on Aging; a report on the strategic planning retreat; and other program business as may be required. The next meeting may also include an executive session to conduct his final performance evaluation, and possibly selecting the next SEAGO Executive Director.

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

**1<sup>st</sup> Vice-Chair Gomez** adjourned the meeting at 12:31 p.m.